

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

United States of America,	)	CRIMINAL NO. 0:04-353-CMC
	)	
v.	)	<b>OPINION and ORDER</b>
	)	
Samuel Larell Anderson,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the court on Defendant's letter, received July 21, 2014, wherein he requests that the court "reconsider my situation" based upon recent changes in the law. ECF No. 658.

To the extent Defendant's request is construed as a motion to reconsider, Rule 35(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure permits a court to "correct a sentence that resulted from arithmetical, technical, or other clear error" within fourteen days after the oral announcement of the sentence. See Rules 35(a) and (c), Fed.R.Crim.P. The sentence was orally announced on July 20, 2006, and, accordingly, the deadline for any action by the court on a Rule 35(a) motion has passed. Therefore, the court is without jurisdiction to act upon Defendant's motion in this regard.

Apart from Rule 35(a), a district court has no jurisdiction to alter a defendant's term of imprisonment except as authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3582 or 18 U.S.C. § 3742.

Title 18 United States Code § 3582(c) limits the court's authority to modify a final judgment that includes a sentence of imprisonment to three specific circumstances. See 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) (the court can modify a judgment (1) upon motion of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") for statutorily-specified reasons, (2) upon motion of the government for substantial assistance, or (3) upon motion of the defendant or the BOP, or upon the court's own motion, because of a subsequent

lowering of the applicable sentencing range). None of these circumstances applies to Defendant at this time.

After an appeal, the court can modify a sentence if the sentence is found by the appellate court to have been imposed in violation of law or imposed as a result of an incorrect application of the sentencing guidelines, as provided for in 18 U.S.C. § 3742. Defendant's conviction and sentence were affirmed on appeal.

Defendant's letter, construed as a motion for reduction of sentence, does not allege that any of these circumstances applies. The court lacks jurisdiction to modify Defendant's sentence, and therefore, Defendant's motion is denied for lack of jurisdiction.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
July 24, 2014